

E 432


.F82

Copy 2

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0000502321A



FRANK PIERCE. HIS POLITICAL LIFE.

HIS APPEARANCE IN THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES.

HIS NOMINATION FOR THE PRESIDENCY.

HIS ELECTION, AND VIOLATION OF THE PLEDGES OF HIS LETTER OF ACCEPTANCE, AND INAUGURAL ADDRESS.

HIS CONNECTION WITH THE BREAKING UP OF THE COMPROMISE OF 1850.

HIS EFFORTS TO RENDER KANSAS A SLAVE STATE.

HE AUTHORIZED THE CALLING OUT THE FEDERAL FORCES TO PUT DOWN THE ADVOCATES OF FREEDOM.

HE EULOGIZED JEFF. DAVIS AND EXPRESSED HIS PREFERENCE FOR HIM AS THE DEMOCRATIC NOMINEE FOR PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

HE DECLARED THAT IN THE EVENT OF AN ATTEMPT ON THE PART OF THE SOUTH TO SECEDE, THE DEMOCRACY OF THE NORTH WOULD AID HER; AND THAT THE NORTHERN CITIES SHOULD BE DYED WITH BLOOD.

HE INDEAVORED TO MAKE GOOD HIS ASSURANCE TO JEFF DAVIS.

HE MISREPRESENTS THE FATHERS OF THE REPUBLIC. HE VINDICATES THE TRAITORS OF BALTIMORE.

HE DENOUNCES THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES AND HER AGENTS.

HE IS OPPOSED TO THE EXERCISE OF THE CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS FOR THE SUPPRESSION OF REBELLION, AND THE PUNISHMENT OF TREASON.

HE PROPOSES TO MEET THE VIOLENCE AND INVASIONS OF ITS ARMIES BY "MORAL SUASION."

HE HAS NO CENSURE FOR ITS LEADERS, ETC., ETC.

HON. FRANKLIN PIERCE

Concord, New Hampshire :

SIR: There is an Eastern tale which describes one who, commencing life amid the quiet and gentleness of a pure and invigorating locality, and with the innocency of an uncontaminated heart, became, as he advanced in life, the idolized favorite of a numerous clan, and finally their selected chief.

But intoxicated by the position to which he was elevated, and misled by the madness of ambition, he abandoned the interests of his clan, and appeared as the base agent and emissary of a corrupt and ignoble tribe.

And when, at length, "the strife and clangor of arms" raged between them, his sympathies were with *that tribe*, in all of its hostile purposes and movements, and he cheered them on, by carefully considered words and studied actions, and thus rendered himself an object of scorn and censure in the annals of his native spot.

This fiction of the East well illustrates the early life, and more advanced days, of an inhabitant of the Western Hemisphere, and of the Republic of America.

You, sir, are that inhabitant.

Born amid the salubrious breezes of Hillsborough, New Hampshire, on the 23d of Nov., 1804, in 1827 you opened a law office in that place, and soon entered upon the arena of politics; and from 1829 to 1832, you were a member of the House of Representatives.

You were then a Jackson Democrat, and concurring with that immortal hero and Statesman, and with the Democratic Convention which met at Concord on the 15th of June, 1830, you were "opposed to any scheme of national disunion."

[See Democratic Text Book.]

In 1833 you were elected a member of the 23d Congress and accordingly took your seat in the House of Representatives.

Subsequently you were elected to the Senate of the United States, and entered upon the discharge of your duties at the extra session which convened on the 4th of March, 1837.

From this period until 1842, you were a member of that body.

It was, doubtless, sir, while connected with these bodies, that the malignant influences of a Southern city, and the promises and flatteries of selfish partizans, penetrated, "as a fatal cancer," into the purity of brain and heart which you had originally possessed amid the streams and mountains of your buoyant and happy youth."

But these influences, as the poison of the Simoon, were invisible, and you concealed their effects upon your character, and moved and spoke and acted as one untarnished and unfallen.

Time passed on. I cannot dwell upon your nomination for Governor of New Hampshire. Upon your nomination by President Polk, as Attorney General of the United States—nor yet upon the manner in which, untouched by the fire of the enemy, you “fainted” and fell from your stumbling steed, in the month of August, 1847, at the battle of Contreras.

Passing over nearly five years, I come to June, 1852. In that month the Convention of the “American Democracy” assembled at Baltimore, and on the one hundred and forty-ninth ballot you were selected as the candidate for President.

That Convention passed, among others, this resolution :

“Resolved, That the Democratic party will resist all attempts at renewing, in Congress or out of it, the agitation of the slavery question under whatever shape or color the attempt may be made.”

(See “The Campaign,” Washington City, D. C.
Proceedings of Baltimore Convention, etc.)

Your letter of acceptance was dated

CONCORD, N. H., *June 17, 1852.*

In it you said:

“I accept the nomination upon the platform adopted by the Convention, not because this is expected of me as a candidate, but because the principles it embraces command the approbation of my judgment.”

James Buchanan, referring to your nomination, and that of Hon. Wm. R. King, for the Vice Presidency, said:

“The late Baltimore Convention, in obedience to our will, has erected a platform of principles, in the midst of the nation, on which every true Democrat can proudly stand. Does the man live, be he Democrat or Whig, who, knowing Franklin Pierce and William R. King, believes they will prove faithless to any one of these principles? The great Democratic party of the Union have delivered to these their chosen candidates, a chart by which they stand pledged, in the most solemn manner, to guide the ship of State; and my life upon the issue, they will never deviate from the prescribed course. In voting for these candidates, then, every Democrat will be voting for his own cherished principles and sustaining the platform of his party.”

(Democratic Text-Book, p. 33.)

With your promises, and these and similar assurances before them, a majority of the American votes supported you.

You were elected President of the United States of America over the veteran and hero, Gen. Winfield Scott, and on the 3d of March, 1853, you were inaugurated.

And in your inaugural address, referring to your letter of acceptance, you declared that "*your views on the Compromise of 1850 were clear and unequivocal*"—and added, "*I fervently hope that the question (i. e. of slavery,) is at rest.*"

But, alas! for the frailty corruption and errors of mankind!

Scarcely, sir, had you articulated the oath of office—scarcely had the kissed Bible passed from your hand until the falsity of your promises and the hypocrisy of your "fervent hopes" became apparent.

In a little while you were secluded from the public eye and "curtained" "with leading politicians from below Mason and Dixon's line," for the purpose of maturing schemes for the repeal of the compromise measures, and the indefinite extension of African Slavery over the American continent.*

A bill denominated "The Kansas Nebraska Bill," ultimately sprang from this conclave as Minerva from the cleft brain of Jupiter.

It was discussed. Webster and Clay were gone. Cass was feeble. Opposition was useless. The Bill was passed on the 30th of May 1854.

And you, sir, approved it.

Your solemn pledges written and uttered on earth, and registered in Heaven, were utterly disregarded. More, sir, they were deliberately violated.

AS A CONSEQUENCE, THE TRANQUILITY OF THE NATION WAS RUDELY DISTURBED.

Agitation arose. It swept on. It unfolded itself, in all of its power and violence, upon the once peaceful soil of Kansas. Her territory was invaded by armed desperadoes from Missouri and other Southern States. Legal voters were driven from the

*It is true, that in your first annual message, referring to the fact that the compromises of 1850 "had given renewed vigor to our institutions, and restored a sense of security and repose to the public mind," you used this language: *That this repose is to suffer no shock during my official term, IF I HAVE POWER TO PREVENT IT, those who placed me here may be assured.*"

But it will be observed that this assurance was qualified by the words "*If I have power to prevent it,*"—a qualification which implied that you were not ignorant of efforts being made to disturb the "repose," and which was in fact designed to prepare the way for your subsequent base and unfaithful action in relation to it.

Why sir, you *had* the power. And the eighth "resolution" of the Baltimore Convention, approved of the exercise of the "*veto power.*" You could have used it and preserved the repose of the country; but this you had no desire to do.

In this connection it may be added that the writer of this letter was a member of "the Democratic party" in 1852, and one of your earnest and untiring advocates. In 1853 and 1854, he was "in the House of Representatives of a Democratic State," and during this period a delegate to one of her State Conventions, and a member of "the Committee on Resolutions." That Convention was "felt" from Washington city, in relation "to setting aside the Compromise of 1850." *It was then and there, that the writer first obtained authoritative information concerning your contemplated and afterwards developed perfidy.* He was allowed "*an inside view*" of your character and conduct. That view will not soon be forgotten. It is "in vivid remembrance," while this letter is being prepared.

polls; ballot-boxes were seized and destroyed; property was stolen; houses were entered, plundered, and burned; women and children were insulted and violated; men were tarred and feathered and murdered; printing presses were destroyed; and "freedom of speech" was violently stricken down.

(See pp. 129, 152, 275, 276, Gov. Geary's administration in Kansas.)

And while these acts—THE LEGITIMATE RESULTS OF YOUR PERIDY AND FALSEHOODS—were occurring, what, sir, did you do?

Among other things, you sent a special message to Congress, which was read on the 24th of January, 1856, in which, after a labored vindication of the pro-slavery ruffians "of States near to the Territory of Kansas" and of "the Shawnee mission legislature," you misrepresented the action of the Northern States, and denounced the citizens of the Territory, who had called a convention to form "a free State Constitution." You even went so far as to declare that this simple act was "*revolutionary*," and that it would become "*treasonable*" if it reached the length of organized resistance by force to the fundamental or any other federal law, and to the authority of the General Government.

You then proceed to say:

"In such an event, the path of duty for the Executive is plain. The Constitution requiring him to take care that the laws of the United States be faithfully executed, if they be opposed in the Territory of Kansas, he may and should place at the disposal of the marshal any public force of the United States which happens to be within the jurisdiction, to be used as a portion of the *Posse Comitatis*; and, if that do not suffice to maintain order, then he may call forth the militia of one or more States for that object, or employ for the same object any part of the land or naval force of the United States. So, also, if the obstruction be to the laws of the Territory, and it be duly presented to him as a case of insurrection, he may employ for its suppression the militia of any State, or the land or naval force of the United States. And if the Territory be invaded by the citizens of other States, whether for the purpose of deciding elections or for any other, and the local authorities find themselves unable to repel or withstand it, they will be entitled to, and upon the fact being fully ascertained, they shall most certainly receive the aid of the General Government.

* * * * *

"Entertaining these views, it will be my imperative duty to exert the whole power of the Federal Executive to support public order in the Territory; to vindicate its laws, whether Federal or local, against all attempts of organized resistance; and so to protect its people in the establishment of their own institutions."

(See 3d vol. Statesman's Manual, pp. 2133, 2134.)
(Cluskey's Political Text-Book, p. 365, 366.)

This expression of your views, and of your conception of duty, was followed on the 15th and 16th of February, by two orders issued from members of your Cabinet.

The first was from JEFF. DAVIS, Secretary of War. It was dated—

"War Department, Washington, Feb'y 15, 1856," and was addressed separately to Col. E. V. Sumner and Brevet Colonel P. St. G. Cooke.

It contained this clause :

"If the Governor of the Territory, finding the ordinary course of judicial proceedings and the powers vested in the United States Marshals, inadequate for the suppression of insurrectionary combinations or armed resistance to the execution of the law, should make requisition upon you to furnish a military force to aid him in the performance of that official duty, you are hereby directed to employ for that purpose such part of your command as may, in your judgment, consistently be detached from their ordinary duty."

(See Brewerton's War in Kansas, p. 373.)

(National Intelligencer, Feb'y 20, 1856.)

The second was addressed to "Hon. Wilson Shannon, Governor of the Territory of Kansas."

It was dated—

"DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
"Washington, Feb'y 16, 1856."

and was over the signature of *W. L. Marey*.

It was directed Gov. Shannon.

"In order to execute the laws and preserve the peace, you are hereby authorized to make requisition upon the officers commanding the United States military forces at Fort Leavenworth and Fort Riley, for such assistance as may be needed for the above specified purpose."

(Ib. p. 372.)

Now, fairly examined, these documents disclose the fact that the two last were simply designed to carry out the opinions expressed in the first. It is true that, *in terms*, power was given to Cols. Sumner and Cooke, to use the military force of the General Government for the suppression of *insurrectionary combinations against the law*, and Gov. Shannon was directed to call upon them for such assistance as he might need to *execute the laws* and preserve the peace.

But, then, in your message, you had limited the phrase "insurrectionary combinations" to the advocates of freedom and opponents of involuntary servitude, and designated, not *eo nomine*, but yet distinctly, *the laws of the Shawnee legislature as those which should be enforced*—laws of which Gen. Cass, on the 13th of May, 1856, in the Senate chamber of the nation, spoke thus:—"OFFENCES ARE CREATED AND PROHIBITIONS AND PENALTIES PROVIDED IRRECONCILABLE WITH THE FIRST PRINCIPLES OF HUMAN FREEDOM AND REVOLTING TO AMERICAN FEELINGS."*

(Appendix Cong. Globe, 34th Cong., 1st Session, p. 525.)

* [See Statutes Kansas Territory, 1855, chap. 151, page 715. Sec 11 and 12. *Et ante and seq.*]

SEC. 11. If any person print, write, introduce into, publish or circulate, or cause to be brought into, printed, written, published, or circulated, or shall knowingly aid or assist in bringing into, printing, publishing, or circulating, within this territory, any

But this fact was of no importance to you. By bayonets, and musketry, and cannon, and devastation, you were prepared to execute them!

The demon of human bondage demanded the fearful sacrifice, and you eagerly responded to the demand.

Well has Milton said,

“Devil damned, with devil firm concord holds.”

The concord is no less firm and appalling among men of debased principles and ignoble motives.

But I must not dwell here. Not because you aimed to prevent it, but because

“There’s a Divinity that shapes our ends,
Rough-hew them as we may;”

no hostile collision occurred in Kansas between the national forces and the champion of freedom.

Time rolled on, and at length the goddess of liberty sat down an exultant victor on the plains and by the streams of Kansas.

But the conflict of ideas and principles, of interest and passion, which had arisen from your broken vows and forgotten oath, was not terminated. It continued.

The South, forgetting all the teachings and hopes of the fathers, and impelled by the madness of her ambition, determined never to be contented unless her principles, purposes and institutions should be planted in every section of the Nation,* and be protected by the organic law of the land—in fact, by the combined action of the Federal and State Governments.

book, paper, pamphlet, magazine, handbill, or circular, containing any statements, arguments, opinions, sentiment, doctrine, advice, or innuendo, calculated to produce a disorderly, dangerous, or rebellious disaffection among the slaves in this Territory, or to induce such slaves to escape from the service of their masters, or to resist their authority, he shall be guilty of felony, and be punished by imprisonment and hard labor for a term not less than five years.

SEC. 12. If any free person, by speaking or writing, assert or maintain that persons have not the right to hold slaves in this Territory, or shall introduce into this territory, print, publish, write, circulate or cause to be introduced into this Territory written, printed, published or circulated in this Territory, any book, paper, magazine, pamphlet or circular, containing any denial of the right of persons to hold slaves in this Territory, such person shall be deemed guilty of felony, and punished by imprisonment and hard labor for a term of not less than two years.

And yet, sir, after having endeavored to put these Sections “in full operation,” at the point of the bayonet, you have the temerity—the effrontery to prate about “*freedom of speech and liberty of the Press.*”

Well might the Roman statesmen and orator come back to earth, appear in Concord, N. H. and exclaim—*O tempora, O mores!*

* In proof of this, I may refer to the following resolution of Jeff. Davis, your special friend, your *beau ideal* of humanity, offered in the Senate of the United States, on the 29th of Dec., 1860.

In the “*Annual Cyclopaedia*,” 1861, p. 186, it is said, “it contains in a few words the entire claim, made by Southern members, of what was necessary to secure their rights.”

If this should not be permitted and authorized, disunion, disruption, secession were proclaimed as the "alternative."

The Presidential contest was coming on.

It was the month of January, 1860; and you, as in former days, were in secret, active consultation with the chiefs and champions of the South.

To sustain this declaration, the following letter may be produced:

CLARENDON HOTEL, *January 6, 1860.*

MY DEAR FRIEND:—I wrote you an unsatisfactory note a day or two since. I have just had a pleasant interview with Mr. Shepley, whose courage and fidelity are equal to his learning and talents. He says he would rather fight the battle with you as the standard bearer, in 1860, than under the auspices of another leader. The feeling and judgment of Mr. S. in this relation is, I am confident, rapidly gaining ground in New England. Our people are looking for "the coming man." One who is raised by all the elements of his character above the atmosphere ordinarily breathed by politicians. A man really fitted for this emergency by his ability, courage, broad statesmanship and patriotism. Col. Seymour (Tho's H.) arrived here this morning, and expressed his views in this relation in almost the identical language used by Mr. Shepley. It is true that in the present state of things at Washington, and throughout the country, no man can predict what changes two or three months may bring forth. Let me suggest that in the morning debates of Congress, full justice seems to me not to have been done to the Democracy of the North. I do not believe that our friends at the South have any just idea of the state of feeling hurrying at this moment to the pitch of intense exasperation between those who respect their political obligations, and those who have apparently no impelling power but that which fanatical passion on the subject of domestic slavery imparts. WITHOUT DISCUSSING THE QUESTION OF RIGHT—of abstract power TO SECEDE, *I have never believed that actual disruption of the Union can occur without blood; and if through the madness of Northern Abolitionists that dire calamity must come, the fighting will not be along Mason and Dixon's line merely.* IT WILL BE WITHIN OUR OWN BORDERS, IN OUR OWN STREETS, BETWEEN THE TWO CLASSES OF CITIZENS TO WHOM I HAVE REFERRED. THOSE WHO DEFEY LAW AND SCOUT CONSTITUTIONAL OBLIGATIONS, WILL, IF WE EVER REACH THE ARBITRAMENT OF ARMS, FIND OCCUPATION ENOUGH AT HOME. Nothing but the state of Mrs. Pierce's health would induce me to leave the country now, although it is quite likely that my presence at home would be of little service. I have tried to impress upon our people, especially in New Hampshire and Connecticut, where the only elections are to take place during the coming spring, that while our Union meetings are all in the right direction and well enough for the present, they will not be worth the paper upon which their resolutions are written unless we can overthrow political Abolitionism at the polls and repeal the

Resolved, That it shall be declared, by amendment of the Constitution, that property in slaves, recognized as such by the local law of any of the States of the Union, shall stand on the same footing, in all constitutional and federal relations, as any other species of property, shall not be subject to be divested or impaired by the local law of any other State, either in escape thereto, or of transit or sojourn of the owner therein; and in no case whatever, shall such property be subject to be divested or impaired by any legislative act of the United States, or of any of the Territories thereof.—Congressional Globe, 2d Sess., 36th Cong., Part 1, p. 190.

"This 'claim,' it will be seen, included, among other things, (1,) an amendment of the Federal Constitution; (2,) the placing of slaves and horses, mules and hogs, etc., on the same ground of ownership; (3,) the upholding of this created status of slaves by the executive, judicial, and legislative departments of the Government; (4,) and their uncontrolled transit and sojourn with their masters in the free States. Now, all this, and more, you were willing to concede to "the South." You would do so to-day. What mockery, then, sir, what deception, is there in your party cry and motto, "*The Constitution as it is and the Union as it was!*"

unconstitutional and obnoxious laws which in the cause of "personal liberty" have been placed upon our statute books. I shall look with deep interest, and not without hope, for a decided change in this relation.

Ever and truly your friend,

FRANKLIN PIERCE.

Hon. JEFF. DAVIS, Washington, D. C.

This letter was discovered near Jackson, Miss., among the private papers of "the coming man," and rendered public by William H. Gibbs, Captain Co. H, 15th Ill. regt., 2d brigade, 4th division, 17th army corps, Army Tennessee.

And what, sir, does it show? Not simply the facts that you were in consultation with Jeff. Davis—that you regarded him as the most pure and illustrious character of the country, and that he was your primary choice for the Presidency of the United States—the exalted position which you had corrupted and tarnished.

But, in addition to these, it establishes the significant truths, that the subject of secession was seriously considered, at the date of your letter, in the secret deliberations of the South; that you had not a word to urge against her asserted "right" to secede—and that you encouraged her to "*put forth the effort,*" by the assurance that, if she did so, she would be aided by the Democracy of the North; that, with this object in view, they would inaugurate war above Mason and Dixon's line, stain and crowd the streets of Concord, and New York and Philadelphia, and other cities and towns, with the blood and bodies of the opponents of secession, and thus give them such "*occupation at home*" as would enable the South to succeed in her attempt at national disintegration or disruption! Thus encouraged, thus assured, sir, in less than one year from the date of your letter, the rebellion of the South was determined upon, and incipient movements to consummate it instituted. James Buchanan, your former eulogist, and, in all the attributes of infamy and baseness, your becoming successor, was President of the United States.

In the Cabinet were, John B. Floyd, Isaac Toucey, Jacob Thompson, and Howell Cobb.

Under their instructions, or in harmony with their indicated views, our army and navy were dispersed—cannon and munitions of war were accumulated in the Southern States—forts, arsenals, custom-houses were seized and plundered—general and field officers resigned—the treasury was robbed—and, on the 12th day of April, 1861, Fort Sumter was assailed, and our flag lowered at the command of Beauregard and his "associates in hostile arms."

The strife thus commenced has swept on as the march of the hurricane. It has stricken down many of the noblest and purest of our population. It has desolated many once joyous firesides. It has taxed to the utmost the resources, and called forth freely

the means of the nation. It has invoked from woman in her gentleness, from man in his sternness, and from childhood in its earnest innocency, a heroic patriotism, a consecrated devotion, and an enthusiastic affection for the country unsurpassed in the annals of time.

But, with all of these sublime examples around you, with the convulsions of your country within your view, with her cries of need and wails of distress upon your ears, you have been unmoved.

Others flung off the fetters of party, and, rising with the demands of the hour and country, became as Butler, Burnside, Sickles, Cochran, Meagher, McClelland and Logan, Cass, Johnson, Dickinson, Wright, Brough, Brady and Knox—pure heroes, and exalted and incorruptible statesmen.

But you, sir, destitute of great principles, incapable of high emotions, and of grand and noble actions, “bound the fetters of faction more closely around you,” and have only appeared as the traducer of the Government, the opponent of its policy, and the artful vindicator and apologist of its armed Southern foes.

Hence you addressed a letter to the late Senator Pierce, of Maryland, dated Concord, N. H., January 15, 1862, in which, among other things, you approved of the unpatriotic utterances of that Senator, and condemned the imprisonment of Marshal Kane, and other traitors of Baltimore, styling them “worthy sons of Maryland, who have never participated in lines of action, or in startling utterances, calculated to encourage aggression upon the *rig^{ous}* and institutions of sovereign States.”

(See N. H. Patriot, April 1, 1863.)

Abstinence from such *aggressive* action, it clearly appears was all which you regarded as necessary to their worthiness and nobility.

To you it was a consideration of no consequence that they had made aggressions upon the rights of the Union, and that some of them were connected with the murder of United States soldiers in the streets of Baltimore, while they were hastening to the defence of her endangered capital!

But I must not amplify here.

In the flow of time the 4th of July, 1863, arrived. In Concord there was “an immense gathering” of your associates and followers. You presided. You spoke. It was an unrivalled occasion for exerting a high and patriotic influence upon your hearers. But, alas! you failed to do it. You did not aim to do it.

This is what you did: After making—in accordance with what you had written in the letter to Senator Pierce—the unfounded and deceptive assertion that the “Declaration of Independence

laid the foundation of our political greatness in the *two fundamental ideas of the absolute independence of the American people, and of the sovereignty of their respective States,*" you endeavored to inflame the minds and hearts of your auditors against the *General Government*, located at Washington, D. C.

And, in order to accomplish this nefarious object, you misrepresented and villified it. You declared that "the mailed hand of military usurpation" had stricken down, "in the *loyal States*, the liberties of the people, and that its foot trampled on a desecrated Constitution." And, adding that the President of the United States was responsible for the unconstitutional acts of his subordinates, "both civil and military," you exclaimed, in impassioned earnestness, "*My friends, let those obey such behests who will;* you and I have been nurtured here among the granite hills, and under the clear skies of New Hampshire, into no such *servile* temperament." Ah! sir, how extremely solicitous you were, to "make good" your declaration to Jeff. Davis, that in the event of a rebellion of the South, *Northern "streets" would be the localities of carnage and of battle!*

But having thus denounced the Federal Government—the President, his subordinate officers, civil and military, and evinced your anxiety to crimson the streets of the North with the blood of her citizens, did you pour forth any phillipics against the Confederate States? Did you express any condemnation of *Davis* and his numerous cruel and criminal subordinate officers, civil and military?

By no means. But, on the contrary, in florid, glowing words, you eulogized Virginia, and more than intimated that you had no volition to do otherwise.

And then, sir, in your peroration, when about to resume your seat, did you call for any support or vindication of the insulted and torn flag of the Union? Did you plead for the erection of a "great mausoleum of hearts" and hands around the assailed and endangered temple of our republican institutions?

Did you, in accordance with the plan of our Revolutionary ancestors, and the requirements of the Constitution, as framed by them, AND YOUR OWN EXPOSITION OF IT in 1856, urge that "the great rebellion," should be "suppressed" by military force, and treason, be duly "punished?"

Let, sir, your deliberately penned and spoken words respond. Here they are: "From the beginning of this struggle to the present moment *my hopes have been in moral power*. I repeat, then, my judgment impels me to rely upon moral force, and not upon any of the *coercive instrumentalities of military power.*"

Why, sir, what a scheme is this? Aside from the fact of its *unconstitutionality*, and its *antagonism with your former views of duty*, abstractly considered, it is stupendous folly. Look at it. To the gathered and marshalled hosts in arms of the South, you would present white banners and proffers of submission!

Their hissing and exploding shells you would meet with entreaties for mercy and prayers for the forgiveness of asserted and fancied wrongs!

To their dashing and proud horsemen, with their gleaming swords, you would oppose gentle rhetoric and soft and timid logic.

And their invading and desolating hordes you would overcome by essays upon the advantages of peace, and by uncorked champagne, smoking viands, and a triumphal escort to the capitol of the nation.

Sir, the "*judgment*" which would dictate these things, is not, cannot be the "*judgment*" of patriotism. It is the "*judgment*," the perverted, corrupted purchased "*judgment*" of Treason; that of a "clan," which, reckless of the hallowed memories and deeds "of our earlier and better days," and the principles and views of Washington, and Madison and Jefferson and their associates would "*sectionalize*" the institutions of the nation, pervert its original purposes, and join the foes of humanity in crying out

All hail the power of slavery's name,
Let freemen prostrate fall;
Bring forth the royal diadem,
And crown it lord of all.

And this, sir, to a great extent, is the conclusion of the hour with regard to *your* "*judgment*."

It will be more fully the conclusion of the coming ages, and the pen of history will only close your record when she writes that, as the "*moral*" traitor, is no less false to his country and deserving of her execration than the *physical* traitor the name of Benedict Arnold and Franklin Pierce, must be placed in the same roll of infamy and guilt.

And here, sir, fondly hoping that the men of New Hampshire and all lovers of their country will forsake utterly your guidance and leading, and fling off any remaining influence and control you may have upon their actions, and give the warm affection of their hearts and the uncontaminated efforts of their minds, and if necessary, the earnest toil of their bodies for the preservation and welfare of their endangered country. I will conclude this protracted letter.

Yours, &c.,

A DEMOCRAT.



